

尚美学園大学芸術情報学部紀要 第8号

Analysis on Speech Development

How to Draw Interests from Listeners

田中 孝志

Abstract

Through analyzing a slip of tongue, the paper attempts to clarify effective development of descriptions in speech style communication and also sheds light to the reason that causes a slip of tongue. Specially, analysis focuses on interaction between listeners and their acquaintances along with speaker's message.

Key Word: listeners' point of view, third persons, shared circumstances, descriptions, dramatization, the role of a speaker, the role of listeners.

[要約]

本論はスピーチでどのような表現方法が聞き手の興味を引くのかを考察するために失言を分析し、同時に失言が発生する原因を究明する。特に本論では話者のメッセージの描写方法に対する聞き手と第三者間での視点と解釈という観点を重視する。分析方法に関してはボーマンのファンタシー理論を応用し説明する。

キーワード：聞き手の視点、第三者、状況、描写、演出、話者と聞き手の役割

1: Introduction

The speeches that Japanese politicians deliver often result in receiving heavy criticisms and requests for apologies. This is a case called "a slip of tongue." Slip of tongue includes two different developments of interpretation between a speaker and listeners. One is excuses of a speaker such as "not my intention," "out of context" and "misunderstanding." And another is criticisms from listeners. For example, in 2000, the comments of Tokyo Governor, Ishihara, caused a storm of protest among listeners, but he was unrepentant and said "I have done nothing to be sorry for." (いけないこと言いましたか 2000 : 31) Similarly, in 1989, the remarks of former Prime Minister Nakasone resulted in international conflict between Japan and U.S.A.. However, he stated "out of context." (政府 1986 : 2) Also, in 2000, former Prime Minister Mori's comment "Japan is a divine nation centering on the Emperor" (森首相あいさつ 2000 : 2) met with heavy criticisms, but he stressed that listeners misunderstand my intention. These cases usually draw peoples' attention as a political issue or racism in Japan, but

rarely as an issue that we all have a chance to cause such a problem.

Conflicts between excuses and criticisms disclose one point that a speaker and listeners develop each different vision over one message. At first, a vision develops from that listeners have different point of view than a speaker. Then, a speaker and listeners have different acquaintances in creating a vision. That is to say, in case of two different interpretations crash like a slip of tongue, listeners' point of view and vision that they create along with their acquaintances become a focal point of issue. A speaker can consider this issue as a technique to provide listeners with a chance to dramatize their vision. To be exact, the following assumption will be examined throughout this paper.

1.2: Assumption

Should a speaker describe a message for listeners to dramatize their vision, considering their relationship with third persons?

1.3: Purpose

More specifically, the paper attempts to answer to the following questions.

- 1) Does a speaker direct listeners' concern to third persons?
- 2) Does a speaker stimulate listeners' vision to be developing?
- 3) How can a speaker develop a message?

1.4: Significance

A process, in which speaker's intention is misunderstood, prevents the basic needs of human beings to communicate with others. The paper chooses three slip of tongues (Ishihara, Nakasone and Mori) for the analysis because these people emphasized their innocence in the midst of criticisms. With the development of mass media the paper considers a study on speech development in view of interaction between listeners and their acquaintances is necessary for facilitating smooth understanding among people. At the same time, the paper hopes that this type of study will contribute to decrease misunderstanding among people. In the following, an approach to the analysis is explained with the help of Bormann's "Fantasy theme theory."

2: Method

"One vocabulary does not recall the same meaning between two people." (Crossculturalcommunication: 1980)

This sentence reveals that both a speaker and listeners have different initiative in interpreting a message. Since this paper focuses its attention on interaction of listeners and their acquaintances, it signifies that information from a speaker is interpreted in listeners' vision. And along with this point, those who share listener's vision also become significant. It requires a speaker to acquire a technique to stimulate circumstances under which listeners satisfy their needs. The relation between stimulus and satisfaction agree with the following Bormann's definition about dramatization.

If, in the middle of a group discussion several members come into a conflict, the situation would be dramatic, but because the action is unfolding in the immediate experience of the group, it would not

qualify as the basis for sharing of a group fantasy. If however, the group members begin talking about a conflict some of them had in the past, or if they envision future conflict, or if they dramatize a current conflict taking place somewhere else, these comments would be dramatizing messages. (Bormann 1996 : 149)

In short, dramatization is a process that includes one's guesses and changes. It follows that listeners minimize information equal to their size: a reality is dramatized based on listeners. Second, it is about stimulus to trigger a dramatization. It has relation with people around listeners. For example, Bormann introduces as to how people dramatize in the following manner.

The chain triggered by the first dramatizing message is picked up and elaborated by the others. People caught up in a chain of fantasies may experience moments similar to the creative experiences of individuals when they daydream about a creative project or an important problem and suddenly get excited about the direction of their thinking. Then the others feed back ideas and new dramatizations add to the original comment. (Bormann 1996:156)

When dramatization sparks, one can cite people who receive information from listeners. They are third persons in view of a speaker. And when the dramatization sparks, listeners dramatize information in respect to third persons. In other words, for the purpose of drawing listeners' interests, a speaker needs a description that shifts listeners' concerns to third persons and facilitate them to dramatize their relation with third persons. Especially, the feature of listeners' interpretation along with their relation with third persons is explained in the following Bormann's analysis on communication.

A rhetorical vision is indexed by a key word, a slogan, a label. Such indexing is a special case of the symbolic cuing phenomenon, but in this instance, the rhetorical community has reached such a high level of symbolic maturity. (Bormann 1985: 8)

This communication process clarifies how listeners evaluate third persons. For instance, a pigeon becomes a symbol of peace under circumstances where people share a vision with their acquaintances. Similarly, people, who share certain experiences with their acquaintances, are able to generalize the state of statue of liberty as a symbol of freedom. That is to say, a description becomes a symbol through listeners' experiences.

In case of a speaker delivers a message to multiple listeners, who have no knowledge to each other, he or she needs to create a subject who listeners can retrospect to. A technique to perform such a task is similar to "Maefuri talk," in which comedians start talking about daily people before a punch-line. By describing daily people, listeners start analyzing the reactions of daily people to them. It signifies that listeners view third persons as equal size as themselves in observing things around them. It tells that a symbol results from listeners' experiences. Otherwise, comedians' efforts end up as a monologue. In short, a speaker's task is to provide listeners with circumstances, they might go through. Under such circumstances, they envision their favorable relation with third persons.

To sum up, listeners' vision is consisted of dramatizing their relation with third persons. Then, descriptions that stimulate listeners to start having interests are the followings. One is a description

that directs listeners' concern to third persons. Another is a description that helps listeners to start envisioning their favorable relation with third persons. These techniques require a speaker to take a role of an interviewer to listeners, but not an active speaker. Bormann refers to a process as to how a message flows in speech style communication as follows.

The dramatizations which catch on and chain out in small groups are worked into public speeches and into the mass media and in turn, impede them to action. (Bormann 244)

With the development of mass media such as T.V., news paper and internet, people are expected to communicate with people who have various backgrounds. Not only a politician, but other people will hardly avoid such a chance. Therefore, considering how to describe a message so as to draw attention of listeners becomes significant in that everyone will cause a misunderstanding. In terms of a slip of tongue, when a politician aims to gain as much understanding as possible from listeners, speaker's role, description and listeners' point of view and third persons become central issue. A slip of tongue is a case in which a speaker fails to motivate listeners. Through analyzing speeches of Ishihara, Nakasone and Mori, the paper focuses on a process how a speaker considers the development of listeners' vision when delivering a message. In the following chapters, the paper divides each speech of Ishihara, Nakasone and Mori into two parts. The first part is the analysis of descriptions about listeners' concern. And the latter part analyzes descriptions about listeners' experiences. In addition, paper discusses as to effective descriptions in the end.

CHAPTER 3

In this chapter, whether or not a speaker develops a description from listeners' point of view in order to direct their concerns to third persons is analyzed.

3.1: The role of description for listeners ~Ishihara~

今日の日本を眺めますと、残念ながらどうも国の外側も内側もタガが緩んできたなという
感じを否めません。図体の大きな経済国家でありますけども、この日本の姿、社会に起こ
っている出来事をながめると、何か肝心なものが欠けてしまっているなという感じが否
めません。私たちのうちに、自分たちが属する伝統のある、力のある日本という国家社会
に対する意識がどれほどあるかなという疑念がわいてまいります。(石原都知事・自衛隊
行事2000：24)

In the above comment, description "looking around Japan today" has a function to direct listeners' concerns to their circumstances. However, description "regrettable" follows. This is speaker's concern to Japan today. Then, this concern develops to an issue of patriotism. One can realize that a speaker dramatizes his concern to Japan today. Thus, for listeners to have interests in patriotism that a speaker argues, he or she needs to develop descriptions to direct their concerns to third persons. Following the above comment, Ishihara describes "Japan today" in the following manner.

残念な事に今日の日本の政治をながめると北朝鮮（朝鮮人民民主主義共和国）に拉致さ
れていた、あの少女を救うこともできずに、これは政府の責任であると同時に私は国民の

一人一人の責任というものが結束していないその証拠ではないかという気が強く致します。
(石原都知事・自衛隊行事2000：24)

Also, after stressing, "内側からも外側からも解体されたという気がしてならない" (石原都知事・自衛隊行事2000：24) Ishihara, introducing one article from New York Times, comments as follows.

ドイツの降伏は当たり前前に扱われておりますが、日本の降伏の場合には非常に醜い大きな怪物の姿が、そのあぐり開いた口からアメリカの兵隊が3人でやっと牙を抜いている。そして、その解説にこの怪物は倒れましたが、まだ骨と牙は抜き去られていない。我々は永久にかかっても、この解体をアメリカのために世界のためにするんだという記事がありました。彼ら白人にとってみると、日本人だけが有色人種の中で唯一見事な近代国家を作ったということそのものが、意に沿わない事実だったのでありましょう。ゆえにこのへんを非常に危険視したアメリカは、あのいびつな憲法に象徴されるようにこの日本の解体を図って、残念ながらその結果が今日露呈されていることを誰も否認しないと思います。(石原都知事・自衛隊行事2000：24)

These comments seem to describe "Japan today" in details for listeners. Nevertheless, descriptions entail evaluations such as "regrettable," "I think," "ugly" and "distorted." Descriptions are information about third persons from speaker's point of view. These descriptions about North Korea and U.S.A. dramatize speaker's concern, but not listeners' concern so as to have interests in "Japan today," they share with third persons. In other words, a speaker describes "Japan today" along with his concern. Regardless of this point, Ishihara stresses "under such circumstances" and comments as follows.

この国家をいったん緩急の時には守る、国民の生命を守る、財産を守るために精励していらっしゃる。これは当たり前のことであると同時に、実は日本の社会にとって稀有なことであると、残念ながら思わざるをえない。どうか一つこういった状況に決して屈することのないようにいったん緩急の時に崇高な目的を達成させるために精進を続けて頂きたいということを、改めてこの機会に国民、都民を代表して熱願する次第でございます。(石原都知事・自衛隊行事2000：24)

Above comment reveals the role of descriptions in Ishihara's speech. At first, Self Defense Force (S.D.F) is praised as "reasonable" and "rare." These praises are developed under circumstances a speaker argues "regrettable." In similar process, based on the praise "rare," new description as to "emergency" in future develops. In this new description, S.D.F is praised as "supreme" regardless of listeners. "Rare" and "supreme" are the value that a speaker has under his circumstances.

As we have examined, descriptions in Ishihara's speech always dramatize "Japan today" from his point of view. His attention is focused on dramatizing the value of his patriotism. Since descriptions are not stimuli to dramatize listeners' patriotism, listeners are forced to have similar vision that Ishihara has before listening to a speech. Descriptions develop from evaluating the value of speaker's concern to Japan today and other descriptions follow to evaluate the value of the former description. It is clear that descriptions ignore third persons when listeners dramatize their vision.

3.2: The role of description for listeners ~Nakasone~

Nakasone's speech in 1986 is filled with coinages and at a glance it seems to stimulate listeners' concern from various angles. But, descriptions dramatize speaker's concern alone. His speech starts as follows.

自民党がいまままでの固有の客は大事にして、さらに左へウイングを伸ばして、中道のセンターラインまで手を伸ばしてお客を三百四議席分とったわけだ。大事なことは現代社会に適合するような独特の政治体制、政治運営にもっていかなければならない。現代社会に適合するとは何であるか。それは非常にリズムとテンポの速い社会。昔のようにもったりしては国民はついてこない。(首相 1986 : 2)

Description starts from a fact that Liberal Democratic Party (L.D.P) had sweeping victory. And the reason that brought L.D.P. victory is described as "politics that meets the needs of present society." However, "present society," which listeners dramatize, is simply mentioned as "rhythm and tempo." Thus, the speech needs to be developed to stimulate listeners to concern "rhythm and tempo" in their relation with third persons. Nakasone describes "present society" as follows.

日本は高度情報社会、濃密激動社会。一億二千万人の人間がアメリカのカリフォルニア州くらいの大きさの島に閉じこもっている。言い換えればアメリカの半分の人口がカリフォルニアに集まって、アメリカ全体の生産の半分、国民所得の半分をつくっている、というのが日本列島という濃密激動社会。しかもこれだけハイテク、あるいはマスメディアが発達した世の中で、日本人くらい情報がたっぷり自然に見ていけば入ってくる社会はない。こんなにいろんな情報がわりあい正確に耳に入ってくる国民はいない。日本人くらい情報がたっぷり、自然に見ていけば入ってくる社会はない。こんなにいろんな情報がわりあい正確に耳に入っている国民はいない。(首相 1986 : 2)

At first, Japan is described as "high density society." This coinage entails explanation "people live in island which has similar size as California." However, it is unclear whether or not listeners envision that Japan as California in their vision. These descriptions are information about third persons from speaker's point of view. The description "California" dramatizes "high density society," which stems from speaker's concern "rhythm and tempo." Similarly, a description "highly information oriented society" is dramatized by "such a high technology society." Such a process clarifies that the role of these descriptions is to dramatize speaker's concern from his point of view, but not listeners' concern.

Moreover, in the above comments, description about California develops to "We have half national income of the U.S." and also description about technology develops to "no other nations have precise information than we do." In this process, one can recognize that new descriptions spring from in order to dramatize the value of "California" and "technology." In other words, a speaker develops descriptions in order to dramatize the value of his former description.

The descriptions in such a speech do not have a role to stimulate listeners' concern so as to have interests in Nakasone ruling politics. Listeners are able to grasp the meaning of "politics that meets the needs of present society" only when they have similar concern "rhythm and tempo" as Nakasone has.

Such descriptions help listeners to lose their interests in seek for the meaning of "politics that meet with needs of people."

3.3: The role of description for listeners ~Mori~

The feature of Mori's speech in 2000 is characterized by that descriptions develop, depending only on speaker's concern. His speech, which intention he excuses as "traditional culture," starts as follows.

私どもはこの神様を大事にしようという、最も大事なことをどうも世の中忘れてるんじゃないかということから、神社本庁に指導を頂きながら神道政治連盟そして国会議員懇談会を設立した。(森首相あいさつ2000：2)

In the very begging of speech, Mori expresses his concern "people have forgotten" toward present society. Therefore, as a speaker he is expected to develop descriptions for listeners to share such a concern. However, Mori continues stating in the following manner.

日本の国、まさに天皇を中心とした神の国であるぞということを、国民の皆さんにしっかりと承知していただくということ。(森首相あいさつ2000：2)

In this comment, emperor is described as god in Japan. One can not name a description that stimulates listeners' concerns so as to envision about an emperor. In other words, a speaker describes his vision alone before stimulating listeners. Thus, listeners expect that the descriptions that stimulate their concern will follow after the above comment. Mori develops the following descriptions.

我々の子供の社会から考えてみると、鎮守の杜というのがお宮さんを中心に地域社会を構成してきたと思うんです。(森首相あいさつ2000：2)

In the above comment, a description "childhood" attempts to visualize a "community" between listeners and third person. Nevertheless, although "community" entails a description "childhood," an attention of "community" is focused on "shrine" that represents speaker's community. It is different from that listeners induce community as "shrine" in their relation with third persons. The role of description dramatizes speaker's vision of community. Moreover, a topic of shrine continues developing in the following manner.

人の命というのはお父さんお母さんから頂いた、もっと端的に言えば神様から頂いたものなんです。神様から頂いた命は大切にしなければなりませんし、人様の命も殺めてはならないんだという基本的でなきゃならん。その基本のことがなぜ、子供たちが理解していないんだろうか、子供たちに教えていない親たちや学校の先生、社会の方が悪いと言えば、私はその通りだと思う。(森首相あいさつ2000：2)

In this comment, the value of community is expressed by "life." And this value of life develops further to an "elemental" educational issue through a description "god gives us life." These descriptions are information about third persons from speaker's point of view. It is unclear whether or not listeners envision their community through the value of life or god. Also one can notice that new description about "life" stems from the purpose of dramatizing the value of the former description about "community". For example, description "I think so" is a sort of self encouragement to his concern how community should be and also proves where speaker's attention is focused. Descriptions in a speech are

speaker's self dramatization as to the value of his concern.

The role of descriptions in Mori's speech is to dramatize his concern from his point of view. It follows that in order to grasp a notion about emperor, listeners should have the similar vision about community that speaker has before a speech. A description to stimulate listeners to have interests in "people have forgotten" is not developed in a speech. Descriptions dramatize the value of speaker's concern then result in evaluating the value of the descriptions themselves.

3.4: Summary of the first half section

Characteristic point in three speeches is that a speaker himself is developed in its size along with descriptions. In short, a speaker argues his concern. And he describes circumstances for him to have the concern. Then, he develops descriptions to dramatize the value of his circumstances. Descriptions that are supposed to direct listeners' concerns to third persons are used for dramatizing speaker's concern. They do not have a function as a stimulus for listeners, but help them decrease their interests. Further insight on how these speeches develop to a slip of tongue as "Sangokujin," "Intelligent" and "Divine nation" are analyzed in the next chapter.

Speaker	< Concern >	< Description >	< Description >
Ishihara:	Patriotism	North Korea & U.S.A.	S.D.F
Nakasone:	Meeting the needs	High Density	Much Information
Mori:	Oblivion of culture	Shrine Community	Life

CHAPTER 4:

In the latter half of three speeches, descriptions develop along with speaker's vision regardless of listeners' relation with third persons.

4.1: Ishihara ~atrocious crime and Sangokujin~

Ishihara's description of S.D.F develops further in the following manner.

今日の東京を見ますと、不法入国した多くの三国人、外国人が非常に凶悪な犯罪を繰り返している。もはや東京の犯罪の形は過去と違ってきた。こういう状況で、すごく大きな災害が起きた時には大きな大きな騒擾事件すらですねそうていされる。...そういう時に皆さんに出動願って、災害の救急だけではなしに、やはり治安の維持も一つ皆さんの大きな目的として遂行していただきたいということを期待しております。(石原都知事・自衛隊行事 2000 : 24)

This comment stimulated listeners to have the following reactions.

何かあれば警察はもとより自衛隊を出動させ、在日外国人を皆殺しにしていっていいと私には聞こえた。(三国人発言に抗議 2000 : 9)

凶悪犯罪の多くは、国籍で分けるなら、圧倒的に日本国籍者である。...犯罪はその国政や民族、グループなどとは関係なく、犯罪を犯した人を罰する。(知事はいじめの天才 2000 : 24)

知事が練馬駐屯地で「三国人」「治安出動」との言葉を連ねたことに私たちは驚き、主体的に報道したのである。(感情的な顔2000 : 24)

Listeners' reactions disclose that according to listeners' experiences "foreigners" can not be a definite factor to increase crime rate. In the midst of criticisms, Ishihara explains his intention of speech as follows.

国家に頼んで治安の出動を要請する。その演出をすることで、未然に防げると思ったんで、あえてそういう発言をしてきました。(石原知事の発言全文2000 : 22)

It discloses that Ishihara's main purpose is to emphasize the needs of public maintenance. And for fulfilling this purpose, he needs atrocious circumstances. In other words, a speaker already envisions that public maintenance will be enacted in the future. He dramatizes circumstances for his vision. The description and explanation reveal that a speaker looks down listeners from his vision. To be exact, a speaker's identity grows as big as the value of his enlarged vision, in which his point of view elevates to grasp Japan as a whole, but not Japanese citizen. In this case, a speaker has an initiative in dramatizing a vision. The following excuse to press interview, which emphasized that there was no commotion at Hanshin-Awaji earthquake, also clarifies this point.

中国製の覚せい剤がどんどん輸入されてきて、売るのはパキスタン人らしいけど...そういう危険な薬物が、まさに『三国人』、外国人の手によって、この日本にまん延してんだ、...歌舞伎町や池袋。女の人は夜はとて一人では歩けないよ。ヤクザだって怖がって入らないよ。そういう無法地帯になっているんです、ある時間帯は。(石原知事の発言全文2000 : 22)

In this interview, one can realize that a speaker envisions as if commotion is listeners' daily lives. However, he never asks listeners as to their daily circumstances. The above comment is a confession that a vision dramatizes speaker's experiences. In a speech, a speaker develops a vision from his concern and also his identity to the same size as the developed vision. Then, a speaker's experiences are described as if having the same value as his developed vision. For example, "it is so" and "during certain hours" is a confession that a speaker excites over his concern to be dramatizing valuable. A speaker separates foreigners from listeners' vision: he categorizes foreigners in his vision. There is no description that stimulates listeners. Nevertheless, speaker's concern is envisioned as valuable by description, "foreigners" in a speech. In this sort of development of descriptions, listeners have a chance to visualize "foreigners" as follows.

不法滞在の外国人は法務省の統計だと1993年の29万8千人が今年は29万1千人。警視庁の滞日外国人の検挙数も93年の3778件から昨年は1734件と減少傾向にある。(石原知事の定例会見2000 : 22)

刑法犯検挙人員で見ると、「日本人犯罪」が増加傾向を示す一方、「外国人犯罪」は確実に減少しているのである。(三国人発言2000 : 14)

そもそも凶悪犯のうち、なぜその一割にも満たない不法滞在外国人だけをことさらに警戒し、九割をこす他の凶悪犯には注目すらないのか。(三国人発言2000 : 44)

Also, listeners visualize "Sangokujin" as follows.

三国人という差別用語で傷つく人がいるということすら認識していない。(知事はいじめの天才 2000 : 24)

三国人ということばに、日本敗戦後、自分たちに向けられた日本人や官憲の敵意や蔑みの眼差しを思い出した在日韓国人・朝鮮人もいよう。(三国人発言 2000 : 30)

One can realize that listeners share a description "Sangokujin" as a means to represent discrimination in their vision. However, Ishihara denies these interpretations and states as follows.

あなたがた年が違うんで、終戦の混乱の時に、私たち非常に肩身を狭く暮らしたもんだから。(石原都知事の発言全文 2000 : 24)

いわゆる三国人、その中には韓国系、朝鮮系、中国系、アメリカ軍もいて、が不法なことをあえてするする。我々に害を与えることをする外国人を当時の新聞は三国人と報じていた。おれはそのつもりで使った。(歴史踏まえて表現 2000 : 22)

This explanation proves that "Sangokujin" represents speaker's individual vision, which has no relation with listeners' vision. Thus, it is clear that a speaker develops descriptions based only on the process in which his experiences to be developing valuable. Descriptions do not have an effect to convince listeners of their needs of public maintenance.

In Ishihara's speech, demands to dramatize atrocious circumstances for public maintenance come before the real demands of listeners. "Foreigners and Sangokujin," represents speaker's private vision. Some people argue that Japanese people after world war second held awe to Koreans in Japan and reject listeners' criticisms as delusion. Still, there is no difference in that a speaker fails to stimulate listeners' vision to be dramatizing.

4.2: Nakasone ~intelligent and system to produce good results~

Similarly, in Nakasone's case, his private vision independently develops regardless of listeners' vision. His coinage "rhythm and tempo" develops along with the following descriptions.

しかも日本は高学歴社会で相当インテリジェントなソサイエティーになってきておる。アメリカなどよりはるかにそうだ。平均点からみたら。アメリカには黒人とか、プエルトリコとか、メキシカンとか、そういうのが相当あって、平均的にみたら非常にまだ低い。そういう高密激動社会の高度情報社会。(首相 1986 : 2)

This remarks on minorities and intelligent provoked such reactions as "he should retract the statement"(Nakasone Suggests 1986 : A14), "intolerable arrogance"(Remarks by Premier 1986 : A13), "米国内に反響を広げている"and"人種差別"(米議員も抗議声明 1986 : 1). These reactions reveal that his remark conveys racial discrimination to listeners and simultaneously proves that racial differences can not be a symbol to drag overall U.S. performances in listeners' vision. Then, it leads to a question of what factor symbolizes "intelligent" for listeners. For example, a criticism from the United States argues as follows.

大卒でなく、アップルコンピューターの創設者であるスティーブ・ジョブズ氏はアメリカ社会が養育することができる創造性の一例である。(Nakasone's World-Class Blunder

1986 : 41:my translation)

In listeners' vision, "intelligent" are created by one's ability. This notion is represented by Steven Jobs as a symbol. On the other hand, Nakasone argues that criticisms are "out of context." His argument poses a question as to what factor represents "intelligent" for Nakasone. He explains his intention of a speech as follows.

あそこで言ったのは米はアポロ計画とかS D Iとか大きな成果を上げている。しかし米国は複合民族なので教育の手の届かないところもある。日本は単一民族だからやさしい。
(人種差別と米で反響 1986 : 1)

The explanation sheds light to that Nakasone argues movements or process of people such as a racial topic from a fixed vision such as "Apollo project." Nakasone develops similar descriptions in the speech as follows.

日本は教育が進んでおって、字を知っている国民だ。そのころ、ヨーロッパの国々ではせいぜい、二〇～三〇%。アメリカでは今でも黒人では字を知らないのが随分いる。ところが日本の徳川時代には、寺子屋というものがあって、坊さんが全部、字を教えた。(首相 1986 : 2)

What should be noted is that a speaker focuses on Japanese education system, "Terakoya" school with descriptions of Black and European people. To be exact, Nakasone views Japan as a whole fixed system, but not as a process among people. As examined in Ishihara's case, Nakasone does not ask listeners how people around them consider Japanese system. On the contrary, he describes people from the value of his enlarged vision. One can recognize that defining "Japanese people have high literacy" separates listeners from a speaker, in which a speaker confines himself to his vision. Here, needs for intelligent are viewed as an outcome of a system from his enlarged vision, but not as a process in which, people attempt to acquire.

Descriptions are definition that speaker's experiences are dramatized along with his vision. Although for Nakasone racial description is to highlight Japanese system, one can not deny that he argues an issue within his vision. He uses racial descriptions as a symbol for dramatizing the needs of establishing efficient system. In a sense, his descriptions resulted in stimulating listeners' vision to be dramatizing as discriminative. Thus, Nakasone continues receiving the following criticisms.

良く言っても無神経、悪く言えば人種差別の発言に驚いた。(米議会で抗議 1986 : 1)
我々はジャップとか黄禍といった日系米人に対する固定観念と戦ってきたにもかかわらず、アジアから投げかけられたわが国民への固定観念には我慢できない。(首相に面会要求 1986 : 2)

These criticisms reveal that listeners develop a vision from their point of view. They also disclose that a speaker focuses on a process his experiences are dramatizing to meet with the size of his enlarged vision.

In similar fashion, Nakasone's excuse "single race nation" meets with criticisms such as "単一民族の方が好ましい、優れている、といった認識に裏打ちされている" (首相の人種差別 1986 :

12) . This criticism signifies that Nakasone develops descriptions based on his vision, which do not spare a room for listeners to dramatize their vision so as to grasp the meaning of "single race nation." A speaker assumes that listeners might share the same vision as a speaker.

Throughout a speech, descriptions "Blacks, Puerto Ricans and Mexicans" represent speaker's vision to be dramatizing, but not "intelligent" among listeners. Nakasone's assumption that listeners will share his vision let him disregard U.S. minorities in his excuse. The misunderstanding results from Nakasone, who takes an initiative in interpretation process and ignore circumstances that listeners and third persons share as "out of context."

4.3: Mori ~life and mysterious~

In Mori's speech, descriptions that symbolize his private experiences as valuable as his vision are used without any mention to listeners. To the press interview about his comment "Japan is divine nation," Mori states "it does not contradict to democracy" and explains his intention as follows.

(戦後)は主権在民、信教の自由をうたい、侵略戦争を廃棄することを国是とした。天皇のことは悠久の歴史と日本の伝統文化を表現しているということです。(伝統文化はどこでもある2000:2)

According to this explanation, "emperor" symbolizes "traditional culture." In other words, Mori has a vision in which "emperor" is dramatized to be a "traditional culture." As to description "emperor," he explains as follows.

昨日はよろずの神を挙げた。日蓮さんも親鸞さん(のことも)も言っている。すべての宗教はすべての人の信じる心の文化だから、それを大事にしましょうと言っているじゃない。(伝統文化はどこでもある 毎日2000:2)

One can notice that religion is defined according with speaker's experience as "culture of spirit." Also this explanation treats religious figures and "emperor" on the same ground. In a speech, Mori stresses "nothing is more mysterious than human body" as to community as follows.

神様であれ仏様であれ、天照大神であれ神武天皇であれ、親鸞聖人であれ日蓮さんであれ、宗教というのは自分の心に宿る文化なんですから。そのことをもっと大事にしようよ、ということをもっと教育の現場でなぜ言えないんだろうか。...神社を中心にして地域社会というのは栄えていくということ、そんな難しい話じゃなくて、みんなでもういっぺん、そのことを勇気を持ってしっかりやることが、21世紀がまた輝ける時代になることではないかと思うんです。国会議員の会もご指導をいただきながら、本当に人間の社会には何が一番大切なのかという原点をしっかりと皆さんに把握していただく、そういう政治活動をしていかんとならないと考えている。(森首相あいさつ2000:2)

This comment develops speaker's experiences about a community: a description develops from his belief "なんですから" to his conclusion "なぜ言えないんだろうか." One can observe that Mori already envisions a future in which religion takes an important role in education. It is not off-course unsure whether listeners envision their future in similar fashion as Mori since he never leaves a space for listeners to dramatize about how the third persons consider about community. As examined in the case

of Ishihara and Nakasone, the value of envisioned community dramatizes a speaker's circumstances and identity valuable. Then, a symbol "emperor" represents speaker's valuable circumstances to be developing. Description does not represent the vision that listeners and third persons share, but confines a speaker to his vision. Despite this feature, Mori excuses as follows.

（戦後）は戦争を否定し、宗教の自由をうたい、天皇を象徴にし、新たな民主主義体制にしたんでしょ。それをどうこうしようという話ではない。（伝統文化2000：2）

According to this explanation, it seems that Mori has no intention to dramatize emperor as god. But, listeners react as follows.

天皇と神を結びつけるような表現は、戦時中の日本の政治家が、国民をまとめるために悪用した意図さえ思い起こさせる。（三国人発言2000：39）

戦前、沖縄の小学校で神の御末の天皇陛下となったことを思い出した。（戦前に逆戻り2000：39）

It clarifies that although description "emperor" symbolizes a "culture of spirit" in speaker's vision, it becomes a symbol to recall listeners' harsh memories during world war second. Thus, listeners are able to accept description "emperor" to be their symbol only when they envision their community as mysterious as Mori believes. Especially, religious figures that Mori names at random display that a speech is for a speaker and also that a speaker excites over his vision to be dramatizing and speak from the top of his enlarged vision. Such a development of descriptions excludes experiences between listeners and third persons then causes a misunderstanding.

4.4: Summary of the later half section

The prominent feature of three speeches is a speaker defines a speech based on his vision. To be exact, a speaker envisions a future. And he dramatizes his circumstances in accordance with the size of his vision. Then, he describes a symbol of his private vision such as "Sangokujin" in a speech. It clarifies that a speaker is dramatized by his vision.

When a speaker does not consider that listeners create their symbol, speech turns into slip of tongue. Descriptions in a slip of tongue are definition, but not question. Ishihara's excuse "想定することがどうしていけないの?" (石原知事の発言全文2000：24) clarifies this point. Speaker's assumption is not listeners' daily vision. Similarly, one of the criticisms against Nakasone, "何を言いたかったかは問題ではない。問題は何を言ったかだ" (首相1986: 2) can be rephrased as "a speaker should consider to whom and what he describes." Mori's excuse at a press conference sheds light to this point as follows.

記者：ご自身の立場、場所をわきまえず、誤解を招くような発言を平気で口になさる。その総理の軽さが今国民から問われていると思うのですが、どのようにお考えでしょうか。
首相：資質の判断は皆様がなさることでもあるし、国民の皆様がなさることでもあるかもしれません。一つ一つ誠意をもって政権に取り組んでおる、そういう気持ちでございますし、国民の皆様にも理解を得たいものだ、そう考えています。（土屋2000：147）

No matter what excuses a speaker makes, describing a message from his experiences results in disre-

garding listeners. The main problem in slip of tongue is a speaker, who does not consider that listeners dramatize their relation with third persons.

speaker :	ideal vision	circumstances	private vision	symbol
石原 :	S.D.F	Crime	Crime after war	Sangokujin
中曽根 :	Educated Society	System	System & Outcome	Minorities
森 :	Education	Community	Mysterious Community	Emperor

Discussion : role of description and point of view

We are able to know the effect of possibility only when it is tried. Analyzing slip of tongue leads to that a speaker had better describe third persons to draw interests from listeners. In other words, a speaker needs to recognize that a question is always answered from listeners' point of view. The paper considers that a speaker at first accept opinions that listeners have. It is not providing listeners with new information from upside to downside. But, it is that a speaker helps listeners to dramatize their relation horizontally to third persons. In short, a speaker should ask a question "what your friends say about you." "Your friends" stimulates listeners to direct their eyes to third persons. And "say about you" stimulates listeners to dramatize their relation with third person. The followings are the insight that the analysis prefers.

- Description1: Ask "your friends" includes circumstances of people (third person) that listeners see. It stimulates listeners shift the eyes to their circumstances.

- Description2: Ask "what they think" let listeners answer "yes" or "no" under circumstances they and third persons share.

The further analysis of such insight is in another paper that analyzes a speech welcomed by applause of listeners.

References

- 「米議員も抗議声明」毎日新聞、September 25、1986、P1
- 「米議会で抗議の署名運動」毎日新聞、September 25、1986、P1
- Bormann, G Earnest, "Force of Fantasy" Illinois, Carbondale South Illinois University Publisher, P8, 1985
- Bormann, G Earnest, "Effective Small Group Communication" Illinois Burgess International Group, Inc. P156, 1996
- Bormann, G Earnest, "Effective Small Group Communication" Illinois Burgess International Group, Inc. P244, 1996
- 「知事はいじめの天才」毎日新聞、April 13、2000、P24
- コンドン, C J. John, Jr., 「異文化間コミュニケーション」 (Cultural Dimension of Communication) サイマル出版、P49、1980

「伝統文化はどこでもある」毎日新聞、May 17、2000、P2

「いけないこと言いましたか」毎日新聞、April 11、2000、P31

「石原都知事・自衛隊行事発言前文」毎日新聞、April 11、2000、P24

「石原知事の発言全文」毎日新聞、April 14、2000、P22

「石原知事の発言全文」毎日新聞、April 13、2000、P24

「石原知事の定例会見全文」毎日新聞、April 15、2000、P22

「人種差別と米で反響」毎日新聞、September 24、1986、P1

「感情的な顔に残念な思い」毎日新聞、April 13、2000、P24

「森首相あいさつ」毎日新聞、May 17、2000、P2

"Nakasone Suggests Minorities Put U.S. society Behind Japan's" Washington Post、September 24、1986、A14

"Nakasone's World-Class Blunder" TIME、October 6、1986、P41

岡本雅享、内海愛子、木本茂夫、佐藤信行、中島真一郎、「三国人発言と在日外国人」、明石書店、P30、2000

岡本雅享、内海愛子、木本茂夫、佐藤信行、中島真一郎、「三国人発言と在日外国人」、明石書店、P44、2000

「歴史踏まえて表現した」毎日新聞、April 12、2000、P22

"Remarks by Premier Highlight Japan's Attitudes on Minorities" The New York Times、September 26、1986、A13

佐藤信行、岡本雅享、内海愛子、木本茂夫、中島真一郎、「三国人発言と在日外国人」、明石書店、P14、2000

「三国人発言に抗議」毎日新聞、April 12、2000、P9

「政府、鎮静化を期待」日本経済新聞、September 27、1986、P2

「戦前に逆戻り」朝日新聞、May 17、2000、P39

「首相講演の問題部分」朝日新聞、September 27、1986：2

「首相に面会要求」毎日新聞、September 26、1986、P2

「首相の人種差別発言に考える」毎日新聞、September 30、1986、P12

「首相衆院で釈明」日本経済新聞、September 26、1986、P2

土屋繁、「日本を決めた政治家の明言・妄言・失言」、角川書店、P147、2000

「右翼的な本音」朝日新聞、May 17、2000、P39